

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office

March 10, 2000 LB 1107

Senator Wickersham explained, with the current percentage in place, the fiscal impact would amount to \$13 million in the year...school year...fiscal year 2001-2002. With this amendment there would be no fiscal impact of this bill until fiscal year 2007-2008. With this bill school levies would drop, as has been part of law, has been programmed now for some time, from \$1.10 down to \$1, in the year...for school year, I believe, 2001-2002. So that does in fact provide a cap on local property tax support of schools. With 45 percent as the number, projections indicate that in that school year you wouldn't stop at \$1, in effect the \$1 lid would drop, or the levy lid for local school districts would drop below \$1. We'd go from \$1.10 right on down to about 98 cents. The thrust of this amendment is to suggest that we should allow the \$1 limit to work, and then, again keeping in mind the concept that the Legislature has indicated with this bill, that property taxes will not provide more than a certain amount of support for a school system, but to keep that amount at 47 percent rather than 45 percent, so that the dollar levy lid, in effect, would operate until, as the projections I have suggest, the fiscal year 2007-2008. So in quick summary, I think it deals with one of the main thrusts of this bill, and frankly it is approaching it in a little bit more financially conservative manner than would be suggested by Senator Wickersham's original bill. So, with that, I'll be happy to try to address questions that may be asked. Thank you.

SENATOR JANSSEN: Thank you, Senator Raikes. Senator Wickersham.

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: Mr. President, members of the body, I'm sorry to advise you that I really cannot support Senator Raikes' amendment. I understand that he's concerned about the fiscal impact. I think that I acknowledged on General File that there would be a fiscal impact from this bill, if you were kind enough to adopt an amendment that I offered at that time. You offered (sic) the amendment. There is now a \$13 million A bill. I don't want to confuse you about that A bill. The A bill is for an appropriation that may take place in the next biennium. It won't be anything that's effective in this biennium. So I hope that doesn't unduly confuse you, but when you see the Appropriations Committee report and you see the biennial budget for the years 1999, 2000, and 2001, it does not affect the